

## 1: Answering Objections to Inerrancy | LifeCoach4God

*The Objection That Inerrancy Is a Late Invention. Critics of inerrancy claim that it is a late nineteenth-century invention that the Old Princeton theologians (like Charles Hodge and B. B. Warfield) utilized for apologetic purposes to fight a growing liberalism in the orthodox church (see Rogers, AIB).*

Holden is the President and co-founder of Veritas International University. From , he was Lecturer at Faith Evangelical Seminary and, from , served as an adjunct faculty member at Azusa Pacific University. From to the present, Dr. The Top 10 Amazing Discoveries. You may read his Defending Inerrancy articles here and watch his inerrancy related lectures here. He also served as president of the Evangelical Theological Society in You may read his Defending Inerrancy articles here and watch his lectures here. The Danger from Within Xulon, He specializes in the impact of historical-critical philosophical ideologies in New Testament Criticism and Interpretation. During his doctoral studies, Dr. Roach studied hermeneutics, biblical theology, systematic theology, and epistemology. His dissertation focused on Carl F. A Critical Analysis of Carl F. Roach currently teaches adjunctively at several institutions, including: Moreland, and Earl Radmacher. Lastly, he has contributed to The Jesus Quest: He holds a Ph. Fernandes is a member of four professional societies: He is the author of several books: Hijacking the Historical Jesus: The Internet Debate co-authored with Dr. He also was a contributor to The Big Argument: You may watch his inerrancy-related lectures here. Howe has spoken and debated in churches and universities in the US and Canada as well as Europe and Africa on issues relating to the defense of the Christian faith. Richard and his wife Rebekah reside in the Atlanta area. In their free time they enjoy international travel. You may watch his lectures here. You may read his Defending Inerrancy articles here and view his lectures here. He is married to Kimberley and has 4 grown children. He cofounded Del Mar DataTrac, a successful mortgage banking software company, in the 90s. The company was acquired in by Fiserv, a fortune company.

### 2: Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy – “Creation Without Compromise

*Also, the last six chapters on the nature of God, truth, language, hermeneutics, incarnation, and answering objections to inerrancy are outstanding.*

Testing For Truth Hi Are you aware that by supporting the bible as inerrant scripture, you are propagating a mode of thought which has contributed towards ignorance, superstition, deception and fear for thousands of years? In our society we have been surrounded by the influence of Deception in many ways. Some purposeful and some propagated by those who have been fooled. We are all human and naive in many ways, and have let false beliefs have some control over our lives. If the human race had spent the time searching for the TRUTH instead of propagating a delusion, I believe we would all be better off today. I have done research and have personally found many, many contradictions as would be expected of the works of men. In addition to the contradictions, the God portrayed in the old testament is what most would call EVIL. Have you read the old testament and seen the acts that were purportedly done by the God of the Jews? I would never want to worship such a God! Kevin Hi Kevin, Thank you for writing. I disagree with your assessment of the Bible as contributing towards ignorance, deception, and superstition. These assertions you made are quite encompassing and quite serious. If they are to be taken in a thoughtful manner, I would ask that you back up your claims with specific arguments as to how Christianity leads people in the "great deception. How do you judge whether something is true? What rules do you use? I hope we can discuss these issues in a thoughtful way, so that we both may learn something. Lenny Esposito Thanks for your response. I said that by supporting the bible as inerrant scripture you are propagating a mode of thought which contributes. The bible itself provides stories which are used by man for various purposes. Their may or may not be God breathed inspiration in the bible. Unfortunately, I am not currently aware of any way for a human to do such a thing. We as humans have beliefs and faith and working knowledge, but certain knowledge I am not confident we can have. We as humans tend to want to support our hopes. We look for facts which indicate that they may be true. You I assume look for facts which support your hopes, and those of the Islam faith probably look for facts which support their beliefs. Many scientists probably look for facts to bolster their beliefs and hopes. The bigger a belief structure becomes the more resistant it becomes to being shaken and dislodged. As long as a person is relatively content their is less incentive to examine the reality of ones beliefs, but TRUTH goes on regardless of mens beliefs. In my mind one way to help determine truth is to look for patterns, and one way to help determine UNTRUTH is to look for inconsistencies. The old testament seems to support a GOD which condones violence and deception. Also a GOD which is not omnipresent and all knowing. These are beliefs which Christianity supports, however not beliefs that are supported by the Old Testament. In addition the bible has many, many apparent contradictions. I believe many of them are probably REAL contradictions. In doing research on my own, I found many myself. Others have found more. If you are interested here is a web page which some links to contradictions in the bible, along with some links to stories from the bible which are not consistent with a LOVING GOD. Motivation is what drives humans and where there is little motivation, things will tend to go on as they have before. However this view would only hold true if the Bible were not in fact the inerrant Word of God. If it is God-breathed, then proper understanding of such a fact would in no ways contribute to such a case. Now, the problem becomes compounded when we understand that the Bible claims to be the word of God. If it claims such and is not, then we have a book which cannot be trusted because of its obviously erroneous origin. Oh, we may learn a few things about the human condition from such a manual, but we could never take seriously any new knowledge. In fact, we should conclude that since the Bible purports inerrancy, and we teach it to be inerrant, then it is the Bible leading people to ignorance, deception, and superstition. We are merely accurately conveying the intent of the authors. If it is, however, it is a completely unique work and must be viewed differently. The Problem of Requiring Certain Knowledge So, in all the above we see really there are truth claims that are in dispute. It is outside the opinions of man and would be true even if no one held it. We may thin we have the truth, but we are mistaken, but truth itself is something different than that. It is simply what corresponds to the waty things really are. To believe that we

cannot know objective truth leads to many contradictions. For example, if we cannot know anything for certain, then you cannot know for certain that the Bible is not what it claims to be. You cannot state emphatically as you seem to have done that "by supporting the bible as inerrant scripture you are propagating a mode of thought which contributes towards ignorance, deception, and superstition. You see, your claim that no one can know objective truth cannot itself be objectively true. If you cannot know truth, then you can at least know SOME things for certain the fact that you can know nothing , and you then know your statement is false. If it is not true, then you also know the statement is false and that again proves you can know some things for certain. The statement is what they refer to as "self-defeating" in logic. It is much like me typing "I cannot type this sentence in an e-mail" and sending it in this e-mail. Well, I just did it so the statement must be false on its face. For if nothing can be known as true with certainty, then what is the point of claiming that these beliefs are right and those beliefs are wrong? You had written that, "In my mind one way to help determine truth is to look for patterns, and one way to help determine UNTRUTH is to look for inconsistencies. If, as you say that there is one truth which underlies all of reality, then as rational beings we should be able to have a justified belief in certain principles as objectively true. I do agree that inconsistencies are a good place to start, for the primary laws of logic we take to be true a priori otherwise our world would make no sense at all. As to your objection that the Bible shows "real contradictions", I would like you to be very specific. Such a claim is very difficult to argue intelligently without understanding your specific difficulty. Now, it does happen that most of the objections quoted in the website you cited Bible Errancy have been answered hundreds of times. Realize also, that this particular website has a very specific bias and an anti-Bible agenda. As a "Seeker of Truth" I would hope that you would withhold any biases of your own, investigate scholastic works on both sides of the issue and then come to a rational conclusion. If you do have any specific instance I would be happy to answer it, but note that an actual contradiction is very hard to prove. One thing you had mentioned is that Old Testament shows a God that condones violence and deception, while the New Testament God is a God of love. This is not true, for the New Testament shows a God who judges people Acts 5: You see, one can confuse judgment, which a part of righteousness, with cruelty and assume this is a contradiction. You cannot have love, though, without judgment, because evil and error unchecked IS true cruelty. It would be crueler to open up all our jails and fire our police than to punish offenders. Some of His followers DID deceive people, but they were not lauded for it. In fact it is those "warts" showing on the Biblical character that gives MORE credibility to the Bible as telling the story of real people in real situations. Then, carefully reexamine the basis for your beliefs and see if the possibility exists that you could be wrong. I am open to the possibility that I could be wrong, but the evidence has been overwhelming in showing otherwise. I hope that you will pray that if there is a God, He would enlighten your search for truth. E-newsletter Signup Get the latest news and articles delivered to your inbox each month - absolutely free!

## 3: Book Review: Defending Inerrancy Norman L. Gesiler and William C. Roach | LifeCoach4God

*Before I close this series, I would like to add one brief exhortation: We need to be certain that we do not confuse our issues. In reading ongoing discussions of inerrancy I often found objections to inerrancy based on deeper objections to other issues, and most notably, to young earth creationism.*

**Problems With Denying Inerrancy** We turn first to problems that may arise when we tacitly or expressly deny inerrancy. First, if we deny inerrancy, we make God a liar. If there are errors in the original manuscripts, manuscripts that testify they were breathed out by God, one of two things must be true: Either way this would indicate that God is capable of making or of producing errors. Second, if we deny inerrancy we lose trust in God. If there are errors in Scripture, even if in the smallest detail, and these were placed there intentionally by God, how are we to maintain trust that He did not lie in other matters? When we lose trust in the Scriptures, we lose trust in God Himself and we may consequently lose our desire to be obedient to Him. Third, if we deny the clear testimony of Scripture that it is inerrant, we make our minds a higher standard of truth than the Bible. We must submit to the Word, for it will not submit to us. We must give to the Bible the place it claims for itself. We cannot stand in judgment over it. Fourth, if we deny inerrancy, and indicate that small details are incorrect, we cannot consistently argue that all the doctrine the Bible contains is correct. Admitting error in even the smallest historical detail is only the thin edge of the wedge, for we then allow the possibility that there may be error in doctrine as well. And when we allow this possibility, the Christian faith soon crumbles into a mess of subjectivity and personal preference. So inerrancy is not an optional doctrine—one we can take or leave. Rather, it is a doctrine at the very heart of the faith and without it we impoverish our faith and destroy our ability to trust and honor God.

**Objections** There are many objections that are commonly raised against inerrancy. For the sake of brevity I will address only the most common objections, and the ones I have encountered in recent discussions on this topic. Many people argue that since we no longer possess any of the original manuscripts, it is irresponsible to speak of inerrancy. What is the purpose in affirming an important doctrine based on documents we no longer have? I answered this, in part, in the first article of this series, when I quoted John MacArthur. By this providential means, God has made good His promise to preserve the Scriptures. We can rest assured that there are translations available today which indeed are worthy of the title, The Word of God. The fact that there are some errors in Scripture as we have it today, does not negate inerrancy which speaks only of the original documents. The Bible as we have it today is worth of our confidence. Inerrancy is a Poor Term — Generally people who make this objection believe that inerrancy is too strong a term. They believe that such a word demands a type of scientific precision. And furthermore, they may claim that this term is not used in the Bible and was unknown through much of the history of the church. To the first objection, I point again to the definition of inerrancy, and that it refers to truthfulness and not precision. The Bible claims to be perfectly true, but nowhere does it claim to contain perfect precision. As we saw in the second article, the Bible may round numbers, speak in human terms and contain odd grammatical constructions and still be inerrant. In response to the second objection I would point to any number of terms we use that are foreign to Scripture. After all, we say that the Bible is inerrant because the Bible tells us it is inerrant. This poses a problem for some. In Reason to Believe R. Consider the following premises and the subsequent conclusion: Premise A — “The Bible is a basically reliable and trustworthy document. Premise B — “On the basis of this reliable document we have sufficient evidence to believe confidently that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. Premise E — “The word, in that it comes from God, is utterly trustworthy because God is utterly trustworthy. Conclusion — “On the basis of the inerrant authority of Jesus Christ, the church believes the Bible to be utterly trustworthy; i. Where this model of linear reasoning may break down, is that some of what we accept about the Bible we accept by faith. Faith does not render reason invalid, but the Holy Spirit helps us believe in what our sinful, human minds will not accept. But this line of reasoning ought to be sufficient for the believer. I trust that all Christians believe in the first premise, as even most non-Christians, who have made the effort, can see that the Bible is basically reliable and trustworthy. But what the unbeliever cannot do is accept that Jesus is the Son of God and that He is thus an inerrant authority. The Bible is Full of

Errors and Contradictions –” This is a common objection that has been leveled at the Bible too many times to count. It has been answered just as often. It is the question that motivated me to post this series. As often as not, this objection is made by people who really have no clear idea of where these errors can be found, as they are merely passing along what they have heard from others. They read a web site with a long list of contradictions and allow that to feed their disgust for the things of God. For those who are honestly seeking information on the alleged contradictions, there is a wealth of resources available to prove that there are no errors or contradictions within the text of the Bible. For example, Answers in Genesis answers many of these objections. So many of the objections can be answered so easily. For example, here is one I have seen on some sites: The original text makes it clear that God is not speaking metaphorically or spiritually. The days of Adam after he became the father of Seth were eight hundred years. When Adam and Eve ate the fruit they died spiritually and made physical death a horrible reality. They did not drop dead at that very moment, but already, at that very moment, death had begun to stalk them. And their perfect communion with God had been killed. Allow me to provide one example. Consider the following quote from Dr. In far too many cases commentaries on New Testament books have neglected such basic requirements as up-to-date historical and philological analysis of the text itself – The result has often been steadfast refusal to take seriously the findings of archaeological and linguistic research. We believe that there is less and less excuse for the resulting confusion in this latter half of the twentieth century. Closely allied with these presuppositions is the ever-present fog of existentialism, casting ghostly shadows over an already confused landscape. Existentialism as a method of interpreting the New Testament is based upon a whole series of undemonstrable postulates of Platonic, Neo-Platonic, leftwing scholastic, and relativistic origins. The Christian has nothing to fear from scholarship, science or archeology. There are some that really are difficult and for which there are no easy answers. But even then, they have been dealt with by scholars and have been answered well. So how do we answer charges of error and contradiction? First, I think we assure ourselves that the Bible is inerrant and then we ensure that what we believe about inerrancy is correct. We read what the Bible says about itself and express faith that what God says in Scripture is true. Having done that, it is often valuable to turn to the many resources available for those wrestling with apparent errors or contradictions. Most of these questions have been dealt with very well in the past – well enough to give you assurance that they reflect contemporary arrogance or misunderstanding more than error. When challenged with a list of contradictions I believe there is often little value in answering the charges of error point-by-point and engaging in lengthy dialog about each of them. Anyone who is really seeking the truth will find not only the contradictions but the many answers to them. Rather, it is better, I think, to point people to what is true. Point people to the gospel and ask God to do His work in them. Conclusion My intent for this series was to do two things. First, I wanted to define inerrancy and separate it from the other doctrines of Scripture such as authority, inspiration and transmission. Second, I wanted to answer some objections to inerrancy and show why this is a critical doctrine and why it is important that the church continues to affirm it. We must be careful with any objections to this doctrine, for if we indicate that we believe there are errors with the original manuscripts, we strike at the very character of God. The Bible is inerrant because it was breathed out by an inerrant God. Because of this we can have full confidence, today and always, that Scripture in the original manuscripts does not affirm anything that is contrary to fact.

## 4: The Inerrancy of Scripture (Part 3) - Tim Challies

*Glenn Kreider, "Answering Objections to Inerrancy," unpublished class notes for ST (Dallas Theological Seminary, Summer Semester, ), 4. "Nonessential doctrine" means that one is able to not adhere to the doctrine of inerrancy and still be a Christian.*

He states how he answers this in his interview with Dr. I want to talk to you about an event in history that was attested by eye-witnesses and it just so happens their testimonies were so precious to the early church they were copied meticulously, they were gathered, He wants to "keep the conversation there. There are indicators that this may be a problem for Stanley. In the interview with Dr. Brown the absence of archaeological evidence for the exodus of Israel is brought up as an example of an objection against the Old Testament. Stanley illustrates how he responds: We wrestle that to the ground. Two substantive problems are deflection and denigration. Again, as a rhetorical strategy on a case-by-case basis this may have some merit. But eventually the questions cannot be deflected indefinitely. First, people want their questions answered. Even Christians struggle with these issues and there should be some answers given to them. Second, and more importantly, many of these issues are intertwined with Jesus himself. Wolf will say Jesus was wrong to believe in: When speaking of the issue of the historicity of Adam and Eve he is clear to say that he does not believe in their historicity because it is taught in the Bible. Rather, in his words, "I believe Adam and Eve were historical characters because Jesus did. When someone predicts their own death and resurrection I go with whatever they say. Nevertheless, these Old Testament issues need to be addressed as fully as one can. That simply relocates the battlefield. Consider that there are various so-called "evangelical" perspectives which are willing to countenance that Jesus made mistakes. Yarbrough notes that the authors are willing to assert that even Jesus made a false prediction. I want to be as clear as possibleâ€”I am not asserting that Pastor Stanley holds these views. There is no indication of this. I raise these concerns to show that simply arguing for the historicity of the resurrection does not handle all the possible ways that someone in this generation or the next may put these concepts together in ways that compromise the person of Christ. Second, there is the issue of denigration. The way that Stanley speaks about the Old Testament, at times, seems to lend itself to a dismissive attitude toward it and its difficulties. In the recent interview he does repeatedly endorse the Old Testament as important for the life of the believer and even backs away somewhat from his use of the word "unhitch" to describe the Old Testament and the believer. He also states that the various objections against the Old Testament, like the allegation of Canaanite genocide, have been answered by phenomenal books written "to debunk these myths. I have preached a sermon entitled The Destruction of the Canaanites: Pastor Stanley feels that in the "marketplace" you have to give short answers so you give the "bottom line" which is the resurrection of Jesus. But even in the marketplace there can be brief answers given and resources given to those who raise these objections. For example, I was able to direct a person to a specific piece I had written on slavery in the Bible when I was challenged in a public forum on this issueâ€” Slavery and the Bible: Is the Good Book Really "Good? Perhaps without meaning to endorse any denigration of the text of the Scripture, Stanley unwittingly fosters a dismissive attitude by such cavalier remarks. This is motivated by a good intention but it may have long-term negative effects on the church. I am not suggesting that every sermon must be accompanied by an apologetic for the inerrancy of the whole Bible, nor even that this conviction needs to be named every time we open the Scriptures. I have already said that the Bible carries its own self-authenticating power when its meaning is seen for what it really is. In view of what Jesus and the New Testament writers say about the complete trustworthiness of the Old Testament "Scripture cannot be broken," John I am saying that making that possibility an apologetic strategy for making Christianity more plausible to one generation will backfire in the next. The evidence for the trustworthiness of the witnesses of the resurrection is too interwoven with the evidence for the inerrancy of the whole Bible. I think Stanley is mistaken to think that in the coming generations the edifice of evidence for the gospel can remain standing while surrounding buildings of evidence for the Scriptures collapse. He blogs at White Rose Review. Engaging views and analysis from outside contributors on the issues affecting society and faith today.

Opinions expressed are solely those of the author s.

### 5: Articles – Giving An Answer

*Ravi Zacharias says that when you address objections or answer questions about the Christian faith, never forget that you are answering a person, not just a question. A caring person and thoughtful apologist should probe to see why the person is making this objection or asking this question.*

This book—the Bible—has been a subject of an enormous amount of study and criticism which has left the integrity of its trustworthiness seriously in doubt. If the Bible were universally regarded as an authoritarian source book for religious truth, many of the questions we will deal with in Reason to Believe would be easily resolved. But the authority and trustworthiness of the Bible is presently the question. It is well beyond the scope of this [article] to give a comprehensive defense of the integrity of Scripture. Such a comprehensive defense would involve so many complex matters that it deserves a separate treatment. A large number of such works have been published in recent years. But, several common questions about the integrity of Scripture are dealt with briefly here. Is the Bible Full of Myths? That the Bible is a book of myths is a common charge leveled by its critics. Since myths have no counterpart in historical truth, they are considered to be worthless sources of truth. A chief reason is because of the numerous accounts of miracles that are found in its pages. Another reason is because of parallel accounts between such things as the biblical view of the flood and that found, for example, in Babylonian mythology. A third reason why the presence of myth is suspected is because there exist similarities between events surrounding Jesus and portraits of the gods found in Greek mythology. These three reasons serve as the substantial basis for attributing a mythological character to biblical literature. A question of miracle is not merely a question of literary style but it involves important questions of history and philosophy. If a miracle is rejected as a myth then the issue becomes one of the philosophy of nature and history rather than one of literary analysis. Before miracles can be rejected out of hand as ipso facto impossible, the critic must first establish that we are living in a closed mechanistic universe in which there exists no possibility of divine or supernatural intrusion. On the other hand, if there is a God who is omnipotent, then miracles are possible and accounts of them cannot be gratuitously dismissed as myths. If we allow that miracles are possible that does not mean that every claim to them is valid. It is one thing to say that miracles could have happened; it is quite another to say that miracles did happen; it is quite another to say that they did happen. As we deal with the question of an alleged miracle we must deal with it not only on the grounds of the possibility, but on the evidence that is offered to support its claim. One of the interesting elements of biblical miracles involves the sobriety of the accounts. Compare, for example, miracle narratives of the New Testament with those found in the Gnostic literature of the second century. New Testament miracles take place in a context of a sober view of history and redemption. Those who claim them are men of obvious profound ethical integrity and men who are willing to die for their veracity. When evaluating the claims of biblical miracles it is important to understand the total value system of those who are making the claims. The biblical writers, in the Judeo-Christian tradition, write with a constraint that involves a profound commitment to the sanctity of truth. Because there are parallel accounts of ancient events found in the Bible as well as in ancient mythological literature, this is no justification for impugning the writers of Scripture on the basis of the fallacy of guilt by association. If we assume, for example, that there was a natural catastrophe such as the flood in the ancient world, it should not surprise us that the event is reflected on the writings of other ancient people. The Christian welcomes a close study of comparison between the biblical account of the flood and that found, for example, in the Gilgamesh Epic The Babylonian account of the Flood that covered the earth. That the biblical account is already demythologized appears self-evident. However, in a comparative examination of any object or event under analysis the scientific method demands that we note not only the similarities but the differences as well. Mythic creatures that are half man and half beast, for example, are noticeably absent from the Scriptures. Bizarre stories about the creation of the universe are also conspicuously absent. The world, for example, is nowhere described in Scriptures as an appendage of a god; nor do we see notions of the world coming into being as the result of sexual acts of procreation among the gods. Though Jesus is virgin born, He does not spring anew out of the head of Zeus. At the heart of the

difference between Greek mythology and biblical literature is a radically different view of the significance of history. For the Greek there is no overt attempt to ground myth within the framework of history. Indeed, for the gods to become actually incarnate in the realm of space and time is utterly repugnant to the Greek mind. On the other hand that which is non-historical is relegated to the level of falsehood by the Hebrew. This radical opposing view of history is essential to understanding the Jewish-Greek antithesis with respect to the question of myth. Does the Bible Conflict with Science? Perhaps nothing has contributed more to the loss of credibility of Scripture than the conflicts between religion and science that have come out in the scientific and technological revolution. The church is still feeling the embarrassment of that episode. Some argue that the Bible teaches a view of reality that is utterly in conflict with the assured results of modern scientific inquiry. Some allege that the Bible teaches a primitive, prescientific view of the universe which is no longer tenable to modern man. It describes a world of demons and angels which is considered in conflict with modern theories of physics and biology. How does the Christian respond to such allegations? In the first place, it must be acknowledged that the church indeed has made grievous errors in drawing scientific inferences from Scripture that are unwarranted. The Scripture describes nature from a phenomenological perspective. That is, the world of nature is described as it appears to the naked eye. The sun is described as moving across the heavens. The Bible speaks of sunrises and sunsets. And in popular speech modern scientists still speak in the same manner. One only needs to observe the daily weather forecast to see this taking place. We hear about high pressure systems, barometric pressure, precipitation probability quotients, and the like. Yet at the end of the forecast we are told that the sun will rise at a given time and will set at another time. We do not phone the news station and angrily demand that such antiquated notions of geocentricity be deleted from the weather forecast. We do not charge the scientists with being unscientific when they describe things phenomenologically. That the Bible speaks of a demonic world is evident. The Bible does not, however, teach that diseases and other mysterious maladies are caused by demonic activity. The Scriptures recognize and endorse the practice of medicine. I might add that the notion of the existence of a demonic world conflicts with no known natural scientific law. The Bible is not a textbook of science. It does not purport to instruct us in matters of calculus, physics, or chemistry. There are times, however, when serious conflicts do emerge between theories inferred from science and biblical teaching. If, for example, a scientist concludes that the origin of man is a cosmic accident, then the scientist holds a position that is antithetical to the teaching of Scripture. The question of origin is a question of history. The biologist can describe how things could have happened, but can never tell us how they did happen. Is the Bible Filled with Contradictions? People accept without hesitation the charge that the Bible is full of contradictions. Yet the charge is completely inaccurate and misleading. Why, then, if the charge is so inaccurate, do we hear it so often repeated? Apart from the problem of prejudice, there are reasons why this misconception is propagated. There is a problem not only of ignorance of what the Bible says, but perhaps even more so, a problem of ignorance of the laws of logic. That there are divergences of biblical accounts, that biblical writers describe the same things from different perspectives, is not in dispute. Whether, those varied accounts are, in fact, contradictory is in dispute. It would be a serious overstatement to say that all discrepancies within the biblical text have been easily and satisfactorily resolved. There are serious discrepancies that have not yielded full and satisfactory resolutions. But these problems are few and far between. To say that the Bible is full of contradictions is a radical exaggeration and reflects a misunderstanding of the law of contradiction. For example, critics have alleged repeatedly that the Gospel writers contradict each other with respect to the number of angels present at the tomb of Jesus. One writer mentions one angel and the other mentions two angels. However, the writer who mentions one angel does not say there was only one angel. He merely speaks of one angel. There is no contradiction in that. Now, if one writer said there was only one angel and the other writer said there were two, at the same time and in the same relationship, there would be a bonafide contradiction. The problem of the loose use of the word contradiction came home to me in a discussion I had with a seminary student. If it is full of contradictions you should have no problem finding 50 clear violations of the law of contradiction in the next 24 hours. The next day he returned bleary-eyed with a list of 30 contradictions. He admitted that he had work long into the night and could come up with only But he presented me a list of the most blatant contradictions he could find. He made

use of critical books that listed such contradictions. He went through his list, one at a time, applying the test of formal logic to each alleged contradiction. We used syllogisms, the laws of immediate inference, truth tables, and even Venn diagrams to test for logical inconsistency and contradictions. In every single incident we proved objectively, not only to my satisfaction, but to his, that not a single violation of the law of contradiction was made. Not every biblical discrepancy has been resolved. But the direction of the evidence is very encouraging. As biblical scholarship increases and knowledge of language, text, and context increases, the problem of discrepancy becomes smaller and smaller.

### 6: Biblical inerrancy faces a new angle of moral objections, SBTS panel says - News - SBTS

*Second, I wanted to answer some objections to inerrancy and show why this is a critical doctrine and why it is important that the church continues to affirm it. Ultimately, inerrancy is true because perfection is consistent with God's character and because He has told us it is true.*

It is dense, repetitive, dry, and academic. Perhaps this book is better used as a reference. I thought the content was good even though it was tedious. Jun 11, Pieter Lombaard rated it liked it This book is not so easy to read. As such, it is important to not only understand what inerrancy means but be able to make at least a basic case for this truth. So the information in this volume is without doubt beneficial for everybody to understand. This book will push you. It is written at a scholarly level with LOTS of valuable information to digest. It would also be helpful to have some knowledge of Apologetics, Hermeneutics and Theology terms and ideas. The organization can be a bit scattered for me. In order to do due diligence to the topics of the chapters Geisler and Roach are constantly having to re-define terms, re-quote statements and texts and that can lead to getting slightly off topic for a paragraph or two. I personally like short chapters which this book lacks. The chapters are packed full of information including disceting and explaining some of the most well known critics of inerrancy. This makes them extremely long, which I personally find difficult to enjoy and get through. These three chapters were the highlights for me. They were packed with valuable information on not only the most relative objections of the day but how to assess them and defend the truth. I will conclude by saying if you have any interaction with the Bible this will be a great book to work through. No matter what side of the inerrancy discussion you fall on, it will no doubt be an asset to you and your learning process. It was just enough over my head that I was able to learn and pick up some very good information, but it opened my mind to new people and ideas that I will now get to revisit and learn from. It is laid out well, attractive, and nearly complete with appendices, a notes chapter, and a bibliography. I deduct one star for the lack of an index, which is a no-no, in my opinion, for a non-fiction text, especially one used by academics. As the subtitle implies, the authors are dealing with recent challenges to biblical inerrancy. Much of the book is spent dealing with the International Council on Biblical Inerrancy ICBI and recent scholarship by theologians who hold to and promote various types of non-inerrancy this is a strange, if fitting, term. The first portion of the book provides the need for and history of the ICBI. This is interesting as it provides a framework for inerrancy in Christian thought. This statement is helpful as an overview and apology for biblical inerrancy that many hold to whether or not they support or even know about this particular iteration of the doctrine. Many individuals and organizations e. Southern Baptists do officially adhere to this document, though, so many people are exposed to it indirectly. The second portion of the book grapples with the most important works refuting, at various levels, the concept of inerrancy. In more or less chronological order, the authors deal with challenges to the doctrine from the s forward. They supply the basic arguments made by the individual author and comment on both areas of agreement and disagreement, providing refutations of the latter. The last two sets of authors have similar arguments and are treated together. The third portion of the book provides a treatment of inerrancy in general and argues for the legitimacy of the concept. Some answers are provided for the reader to refute the most common objections to the doctrine. If one is not very familiar with inerrancy, this segment might be the best place to begin. I personally believe that this section should have been first in the book, but I understand that the focus of the text is not a general argument for the concept but, rather, a specific refutation of the authors from part two and to a lesser degree the general promotion of the ICBI from part one. Overall, I think this book adequate. I am disappointed by the omission of an index and the commission of the inclusion of non-Christian material, both of which are readily correctable, and which would greatly increase the value of the text for students as well as general readers. I found it humorous that he notes that Origen was deviant for allegorizing the text and yet so effortlessly This book is atrocious and I could barely get past chapter 1. I found it humorous that he notes that Origen was deviant for allegorizing the text and yet so effortlessly quotes various Ancient and Medieval sources in support of ICBI, when those very same sources allegorized the text. In other words, Geisler tends to engage in circular argumentation, question begging, and has a problem picking up on

the historical nuances and differences between those he cites or critiques. Like Augustine, Vanhoozer acknowledges the importance of the historical meaning, but sees importance in going beyond the historical meaning. Vanhoozer, working in the post-modern context we find ourselves currently in, pushes back against the presuppositions of the historical-grammatical. The assumptions of pure objectivity in understanding a text a product of modernity and a sibling to the historical-critical reading without taking into account our situatedness and the situatedness of the text itself and those behind the text. A false assumption and an almost cartoonish handling of Vanhoozer. To those thinking about reading this book: There is nothing to see here.

**7: Common Objections to Inerrancy**

*Immanuel Resurrected Bodily, He is the Basis for Inerrancy. Read more. 5. Scripture can be Trusted Entirely. Answering Objections. Upon learning the TGIS model.*

February 25, Share This is the third and final article in the series on Biblical Inerrancy. Yesterday we defined what inerrancy is not and then attempted to define the term. I suggested the following definition: The inerrancy of Scripture means that Scripture in the original manuscripts does not affirm anything that is contrary to fact. Today we will look at some common objections to this doctrine as well as some problems that may arise if we deny it. Sponsor Become a Patron Objections There are many objections that are commonly raised against inerrancy. For the sake of brevity I will address only the most common objections, and the ones I have encountered in recent discussions on this topic. Many people argue that since we no longer possess any of the original manuscripts, it is irresponsible to speak of inerrancy. What is the purpose in affirming an important doctrine based on documents we no longer have? I answered this, in part, in the first article of this series, when I quoted John MacArthur. By this providential means, God has made good His promise to preserve the Scriptures. The fact that there are some errors in Scripture as we have it today, does not negate inerrancy which speaks only of the original documents. The Bible is Full of Errors and Contradictions This is a common objection that has been levelled at the Bible too many times to count. It has been answered just as often. As often as not, this objection is made by people who really have no clear idea of where these errors can be found, as they are merely passing along what they have heard from others. For those who are honestly seeking information on the alleged contradictions, there is a wealth of resources available to prove that there are no errors or contradictions within the text of the Bible. Many of the alleged errors within the Bible have to do with historical facts. Allow me to provide one example. Consider the following quote from Dr. In far too many cases commentaries on New Testament books have neglected such basic requirements as up-to-date historical and philological analysis of the text itselfâ€”The result has often been steadfast refusal to take seriously the findings of archeological and linguistic research. We believe that there is less and less excuse for the resulting confusion in this latter half of the twentieth century. Closely allied with these presuppositions is the ever-present fog of existentialism, casting ghostly shadows over an already confused landscape. Existentialism as a method of interpreting the New Testament is based upon a whole series of undemonstrable postulates of Platonic, Neo-Platonic, leftwing scholastic, and relativistic origins. The Christian has nothing to fear from scholarship, science or archaeology. Inerrancy is a Poor Term Generally people who make this objection believe that inerrancy is too strong a term. They believe that such a word demands a type of scientific precision. And furthermore, they may claim that this term is not used in the Bible and was unknown through much of the history of the church. To the first objection, I point again to the definition of inerrancy, and that it refers to truthfulness and not precision. The Bible claims to be perfect Truth, but nowhere does it claim to contain perfect precision. As we saw yesterday, the Bible may round numbers, speak in human terms and contain odd grammatical constructions and still be inerrant. In response to the second objection I would point to any number of terms we use that are foreign to Scripture. After all, we say that the Bible is inerrant because the Bible tells us it is inerrant. In Reason to Believe R. Consider the following premises and the subsequent conclusion: Premise Aâ€””The Bible is a basically reliable and trustworthy document. Premise Bâ€””On the basis of this reliable document we have sufficient evidence to believe confidently that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. Premise Eâ€””The word, in that it comes from God, is utterly trustworthy because God is utterly trustworthy. Conclusionâ€””On the basis of the inerrant authority of Jesus Christ, the church believes the Bible to be utterly trustworthy; i. Where this model of linear reasoning may break down, is that some of what we accept about the Bible we accept by faith. Faith does not render reason invalid, but the Holy Spirit helps us believe in what our sinful, human minds will not accept. But this line of reasoning ought to be sufficient for the believer. I trust that all Christians believe in the first premise, as even most non-Christians, who have made the effort, can see that the Bible is basically reliable and trustworthy. But what the unbeliever cannot do is accept that Jesus is the Son of God and that He is thus an inerrant authority. First, if we deny

inerrancy, we make God a liar. If there are errors in the original manuscripts, that were breathed out by God, one of two things must be true: This indicates that God is capable of making errors or of producing errors. We might conclude from this that we are likewise able to intentionally lie, even if only in small matters. Second, if we deny inerrancy we lose trust in God. If there are errors in Scripture, even if in the smallest detail, and these were placed there intentionally by God, how are we to maintain trust that He did not lie in other matters? When we lose trust in the Scriptures, we lose trust in God Himself and we may consequently lose our desire to be obedient to Him. Third, if we deny the clear testimony of Scripture that it is inerrant, we make our minds a higher standard of Truth than the Bible. We must submit to the Word, for it will not submit to us. Fourth, if we deny inerrancy, and indicate that small details are incorrect, we cannot consistently argue that all the doctrine the Bible contains is correct. Admitting error in even the smallest historical detail is the thin edge of the wedge, for we then allow the possibility that there may be error in doctrine as well. Conclusion My intent for this series was to do two things. First, I wanted to define inerrancy and separate it from the other doctrines of Scripture such as authority, inspiration and transmission. Second, I wanted to answer some objections to inerrancy and show why this is a critical doctrine and why it is important that the church continues to affirm it. We must be careful with any objections to this doctrine, for if we indicate that we believe there are errors with the original manuscripts, we strike at the very character of God. The Bible is inerrant because it was breathed out by an inerrant God. Because of this we can have full confidence, today and always, that Scripture in the original manuscripts does not affirm anything that is contrary to fact. Addendum Before I close this series, I would like to add one brief exhortation: We need to be certain that we do not confuse our issues. In reading ongoing discussions of inerrancy I often found objections to inerrancy based on deeper objections to other issues, and most notably, to young earth creationism. While I have not researched this issue extensively, and while I affirm my belief in a literal six-day creation, I believe that a case for old earth creation can be built from an inerrant view of Scripture. These differences may owe to hermeneutics or exegesis, but not necessarily from a lowered view of Scripture. Thus we must not confuse the doctrine of inerrancy with other doctrines, allowing ourselves to unfairly do away with one doctrine on the basis of another.

**8: Defending Inerrancy: Affirming the Accuracy of Scripture for a New Generation by Norman L. Geisler**

*Objections Allegedly Arising from Science. It is objected to the inerrancy doctrine that the Bible has many errors traceable to the inadequacy of the knowledge of the period during which the Bible was written.*

Wes Bredenhof It has been some time since we have heard from the bloggers at Reformed Academic. Last week, however, a post finally appeared from Dr. In this post, she is interacting with an article in Clarion written by Rev. She claims that Clarion refused to publish her response and so it now appears on Reformed Academic. The focus of her article is a critique of Henry Morris. Certainly some of what Morris writes is worthy of critique and my goal here is not to defend Morris. Instead, I want to interact with the last of her conclusions. Oosterhoff and I will agree on this point: Deny biblical inerrancy and the room is more likely to be created. Affirm biblical inerrancy and the room is not likely to be there for creation compromisers. Find out where someone stands on inerrancy and you can predict where they will likely fall on what can be taught or tolerated in terms of origins. This is obviously a vitally important issue. Another point where I can agree is Dr. She states there that we should not ignore the difficulties in this discussion nor cover them up with fallacious arguments. To do so is dangerous and I absolutely agree. Because we are united to Jesus Christ who is the Truth, John The irony is that Dr. This is the way she defines the problem she is warning against: According to inerrantists, the Bible can be proven to be accurate, again in the modern-scientific meaning of that term. Oosterhoff provides no source for that description. She appears to be providing her own description of what proponents of inerrancy believe. Oosterhoff can find some example of someone defining inerrancy in the sloppy way she described. Oosterhoff is aware of the Chicago Statement produced in and signed by over theologians, including several from the CanRC. The Chicago Statement is still widely-recognized as the most precise and helpful definition of biblical inerrancy. In view of Dr. We affirm the propriety of using inerrancy as a theological term with reference to the complete truthfulness of Scripture. We deny that it is proper to evaluate Scripture according to standards of truth and error that are alien to its usage or purpose. We further deny that inerrancy is negated by Biblical phenomena such as a lack of modern technical precision, irregularities of grammar or spelling, observational descriptions of nature, the reporting of falsehoods, the use of hyperbole and round numbers, the topical arrangement of materials, variant selections of material in parallel accounts or the use of free citations. Moreover, if you are compelled to warn people against inerrancy, you need a good definition of inerrancy, and what better place to find one than in the Chicago Statement? But there is not only a problem with her portrayal of inerrancy. Now I could multiply historical examples to prove that she is wrong. However, let me only refer to a highly-respected Reformed theological textbook from the seventeenth century, the Leiden Synopsis. The first volume of this has recently appeared in English translation, so readers can check it for themselves. Sometimes it is claimed that biblical inspiration or inerrancy only extends to doctrines. This notion existed in the days of the Leiden Synopsis already and Walaeus had a ready answer in thesis And here one ought not to pay heed to Socinus and several other Christians who grant that Holy Scripture is divinely-originated in issues of special importance, but that its authors in situations and circumstances of lesser importance were abandoned by the Holy Spirit and could have erred. The traditional Reformed belief has long been an inerrant Bible. Yes, yes, I know about Rogers and McKim and their efforts to say otherwise. Their flawed research has been quite adequately answered by Richard Muller in his Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics and many others see here for a bibliography. This response has already become too long, but I need to raise one more point. To which specific inerrantists is she referring? Certainly, I would grant that there are proponents of inerrancy who take such an approach, but they would generally not be Reformed. Reformed proponents of inerrancy like Dr. Greg Bahnsen have argued for a presuppositional approach. We do not prove the Bible to be accurate, but we believe it to be accurate because this is the way God himself describes it to us, it is the self-attestation of Scripture. Inerrancy is never a matter of proof, but of faith. As I have pointed out before , even some Lutheran theologians have taken this approach to biblical inerrancy. Oosterhoff does not acknowledge that this presuppositional approach even exists and that again puts inerrancy in the worst possible light. Oosterhoff and her colleagues at

Reformed Academic feel a burden to warn the Canadian Reformed Churches against biblical inerrancy, they will need to at least become familiar with the best arguments for biblical inerrancy, especially from Reformed theologians. Taking the weakest and sloppiest statements of inerrancy and demolishing them is easy and it scores points with sympathizers.

### 9: Apologetics Press - Biblical Inerrancy

*Christopher is the co-editor of Explaining Biblical Inerrancy (Bastion Books, ), a contributor to Vital Issues in the Inerrancy Debate (WIPF&Stock, ), a contributor to the Journal of the International Society of Christian Apologetics, and the co-author of the revised edition of Is Man the Measure: An Evaluation of Contemporary Humanism.*

Search The Errors of Inerrancy: A ten-part series on why Biblical Inerrancy censors the Scriptures and divides Evangelicals. The Inerrant Original Autographs are the linchpin of Biblical Inerrancy, but what are these hypothetical documents? They believed that variants existed in some Biblical manuscripts, yet believed that God had divinely preserved the Bible without errors to their day. Bible Difficulties , and as more ancient and accurate manuscripts were discovered, the hope of finding an inerrant manuscript of the Bible vanished. In time, it became impossible to assert that any extant Biblical manuscript was inerrant, such that later proponents of Biblical Inerrancy were forced to retreat from their original claims i. In an odd way, Biblical Inerrancy grounds the Word of God into the written texts in such a way that the Incarnation is relocated and reoriented from the birth of Jesus to the writing of the Inerrant Original Autographs! Since the Inerrant Original Autographs have perished, and even the first copies of these hypothetical documents were susceptible to error, then their exact content is now extinct, and hope that they will be reconstructed is lost forever. The Chicago Statement says "We deny that any essential element of the Christian faith is affected by the absence of the autographs. We further deny that this absence renders the assertion of Biblical inerrancy invalid or irrelevant. And, since the exact words of the Inerrant Original Autographs are lost, then all of the essential elements of the Christian Faith are affected by the absence of the autographs. Biblical Inerrancy has so strictly united the Word of God with the human words of Scripture that revelation of the Word of God depends on their accuracy, so then the absence of these documents means that all of Christian dogma is called into question by their absence because of the direct dependence upon them! Therefore, according to the logic of Inerrancy, if our Bible contains any errors, then it is not the Word of God, and so since there is no way to confirm that the first sources of the Bible were inerrant, since they are now lost i. To say that "this absence renders Inerrancy invalid" is a sheepish admission that the signers of the Chicago Statement are unable to be consistent with their own rationalist system. Since the first copies of the Inerrant Original Autographs contained variants like every copy thereafter , then the exact text of the Inerrant Original Autographs are lost forever, and may never be reconstructed since the parchments they were written upon have perished. Since the very first copies of the Inerrant Original Autographs contained variants, there is no way to certainly know that any verse is free from error. Even if the first copies were Today its possible to perfectly transmit a text document to a billion people in a twinkling of an eye, but its absurd to think that any document was spread this way in the first centuries of the Church. No one person or Church has ever seen all the Original Autographs Before first English speaking theologians of the 17th century imagined Inerrant Original Autographs, no one in years prior had conceived of the existence of Inerrant Original Autographs. Sure there were various quotations by ancient people, when read anachronistically through the paradigm of Inerrancy that sounded like Biblical Inerrancy, but no historical witnesses that refer to the first sources of the Bible being any different in nature to any other ancient document. No single Church or person has ever had access to all Inerrant Original Autographs. All of this means that no Church or person has ever witnessed a complete set of Inerrant Original Autographs. Modern Greek Bibles have essentially reconstructed the original sources of the New Testament The Bible has far greater historical attestation than any other ancient work of literature. It is a false dichotomy of Biblical Inerrancy to say that either the Bible is inerrant or the Bible is fully of errors and lies. In many ways, this eclectic text is a more complete and accurate copy of the Bible than anyone in Church History possessed for the first 2, years of the Church. A highly accurate Bible is not an inerrant Bible. The eclectic Bibles are highly reliable and accurate, but they are not inerrant! Almost every page of the eclectic Bible contains a D-rated verse. Inerrant Original Autographs are aping Historical Adam controversies Our highly accurate and reliable eclectic Bibles are not free from internal problems. Even conservative theologians admit that there is a Synoptic Problem in the Gospels that demonstrates that there were many first sources that were

brought together into the present form of Matthew, Mark, and Luke in the Bible today. Textual criticism teaches that ancient literature is an amelioration of sources from various times, places and redactors, and this is true of the Bible as well. All the manuscript evidence and evidence from Church history indicates that the Bible originated from a very intricately weaved grouping of many sources; and even the Bible says this about itself Luke 1: If the proposition of Biblical Inerrancy were removed, then there would be no further basis for asserting Inerrant Original Autographs ever existed. And in the end, if the true sources of the Bible were absolutely dissimilar to Inerrant Biblical Autographs, then our Bibles would remain unchanged! So therefore as G. Berkouwer once said, the Inerrant Original Autographs are " foreign to the world of Scripture ", and may be safely disregarded in any orthodox doctrine of inspiration of the Bible. The Errors of Inerrancy: A ten-part series on why Biblical Inerrancy censors the Scriptures and divides Evangelicals:

Part one : The commission for preaching. The reasons for preaching Why Government programs fail Java collections framework tutorial The list of the tribes of Israel in Revelation 7 Gothic perspectives on feudalism, urbanization, peasants and poverty The Politics of Experience and The Bird of Paradise Miss Bests Etiquette for Young People The ICU Himali Weerahandi Cbp declaration form 6059b 3. Embracing the arts and crafts movement Back-of-the-Envelope Physics Applied Optics and Optical Engineering, Volume 5 Pilgrim footnotes A commentary on St. Pauls Epistles to the Galatians Contexts, Intertexts, and Hypertexts (Written Language (Written Language) Justices and company Generals January and February Among the natives of the Loyalty group U.S. presidents their animal friends Tolstoy On Shakespeare Musical life of the Crystal Palace Quine and the dismantling of logical positivism Frank martin ballade flute piano The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Authoritarianism Eichmann in my hands Economic integration, democratization and national security in East Asia The Princess Thora Android kernel development tutorial Legome and territoriality in New South Wales The American Experiment Vol 2 Atlas of African-american History (Multicultural Atlas) 3.12 Finding conceptual class Hierarchies Memoir of the author, by James Hedderwick. The promise of the Holy Spirit The handbook of the bond and money markets Maryland Jeopardy (The Maryland Experience) Bastien Und Bastienne A question of identity 16th annual Computers in Libraries 2001 The Origins Of Mithraism